



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/046,481

01/16/2002

Pierre G. Bernard

111172

3560

27074

7590

07/24/2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC.

P.O. BOX 19928

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

ISMAIL, SHAWKI SAIF

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 07/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/046,481

Applicant(s)

BERNARD ET AL.

Examiner

Shawki S. Ismail

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

1. This communication is responsive to the amendment received on April 19, 2006 and the. Claims 1-17 are pending.

The Previous rejection maintained

The rejection is respectfully maintained as set forth in the last Office Action mailed on January 19, 2006. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive and the previous rejection is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 11-13, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **EP 1050831 A2** (hereinafter, 831 application) and in view of **Kish et al.**, (Kish) U.S. Patent No. **5,890,176**.

4. As to claim 1, the 831 application teaches a system for providing document change information to at least one user and for saving a changed document, comprising:

document representation storage, for storing representations of saved changed documents (Page 3, lines 24-34);

a document registration element for enabling a user to identify documents for which they would like to be notified of changes (Page 3, lines 24-34);

a document change monitoring element coupled to said document registration element, said document change monitoring element for detecting a change to said document and evaluating whether said change is significant for user's evaluation (Page 3, lines 24-34); and

a user notification element coupled to said document change monitoring element, said user notification element for notifying users of said change (Page 3, lines 24-34);

a user evaluation interface for enabling a user to indicate the significance of said notified change, and wherein said system is arranged to store a predetermined number of changed documents in said document representation storage based on said user's indication of significance (Page 4, lines 16-19).

The 831 application does not explicitly indicated wherein said document storage further storing a predetermined number of most recently changed documents irrespective of said document change monitoring element's and user's indication of significance.

Kish teaches an apparatus and method that relates to document editing and to editing systems which store document revisions, and, in particular, to a method and apparatus for minimizing storage space necessary to store multiple revision copies of a document. Kish teaches storing copies for a predetermined number of the latest document versions (col. 1, lines 63 – col. 2, line 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teaching of Kish into the invention of the (831 application) by allowing the system to store changed versions of documents irrespective of the user's indication of significance in order to allow the system to store documents that a user may overlook and thus will give the user a diverse storage space.

5. As to claim 2, the 831 application teaches the system as recited in claim 1, wherein said system is arranged to store a copy of said changed document in said document representation storage as a function of a plurality of users' indications of significance of said notified change (Page 4, lines 6-19).

6. As to claim 3, the 831 application teaches the system as recited in claim 2, wherein said changed document is stored as a function of the maximum indication provided by said plurality of users' indications (Page 4, lines 1-5).

7. As to claim 6, the 831 application teaches the system as recited in claim 2, wherein said system uses collaborative filtering techniques for deciding to store said changed document (Page 5, lines 15-21).

8. As to claim 8, the 831 application teaches the system as recited in claim 1, wherein said user evaluation interface provides a plurality of predetermined values for indicating said significance (Page 4, lines 1-5).

9. As to claim 11, the 831 application teaches a method for storing in a system a changed document in network-accessible documents, accessible to users of the system, the system including

a network for accessing a set of network-accessible documents; and

user notification data indicating, for each of a subset of the network-accessible documents, one or more users to be notified when a change in the network-accessible document is detected (Page 3, lines 24-34);

the method comprising:

(a) using the network to automatically attempt to access one of the network-accessible documents in the subset and to detect whether the accessed document has changed or not (Page 3, lines 24-34);

(b) automatically notifying users indicated for the network-accessible document by the user notification data that the network-accessible document is changed (Page 3, lines 24-34);

(c) receiving an evaluation of the changed network-accessible document from each notified user, each user providing an evaluation value selectable from a plurality of predetermined values (Page 4, lines 16-19);

(d) in response to the received evaluation, deciding whether said changed document should be stored in said system (Page 4, lines 16-19); and

The 831 application does not explicitly indicated wherein said document storage further storing a predetermined number of most recently changed documents irrespective of said user's indication of significance.

Kish teaches an apparatus and method that relates to document editing and to editing systems which store document revisions, and, in particular, to a method and apparatus for minimizing storage space necessary to store multiple revision copies of a document. Kish teaches storing copies for a predetermined number of the latest document versions (col. 1, lines 63 – col. 2, line 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teaching of Kish into the invention of the 831 application by allowing the system to store changed versions of documents irrespective of the user's indication of significance in order to allow the system to store documents that a user may overlook and thus will give the user a diverse storage space.

10. As to claim 12, the 831 application teaches the method as recited in claim 11, wherein the decision to store said changed document is based on a plurality of users' evaluations (Page 4, lines 12-19).

11. As to claim 13, the 831 application teaches the method as recited in claim 12, wherein the decision to store said changed document is based on the maximum value amongst said users' evaluations (Page 4, lines 1-5).

12. As to claim 17, the 831 application teaches the method as recited in claim 11, further receiving users' comments relating to said user evaluations (Page 4, lines 12-22).

13. Claim 4-5, and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over European Patent Application **EP 1050831 A2** (hereinafter, 831 application) and in view of **Kish et al.**, (Kish) U.S. Patent No. **5,890,176** and further in view of European Patent Application **EP 1111517 A2** (hereinafter, 517 application).

14. As to claims 4-5 and 14-15, the 831 application teaches the claimed invention as shown above. The 831 application and Kish do not explicitly teach wherein the decision to store said changed document is based on a weighted sum of the users' evaluations and wherein said changed document is stored when said weighted sum exceeds a predetermined threshold value.

The 517 application teaches a system and method for caching based on a relative value of their content and the value data is provided from a recommender system that provides a value for a document according to user recommendations. The recommender system assigns a value to a document depending on the users weighted sum of user ratings and stores the document with the highest value (Page 5, lines 7-12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teaching of the 517 application into the 831 application and Kish in order to get a more accurate reading. The system is able to customize the ratings of the user in order to take account of the proportional relevance of each rating, rather than treating each rating equally thus the results will be more precise and closer to desired outcome.

15. Claims 7, 9, 10 and 16, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over European Patent Application **EP 1050831 A2** (hereinafter, 831 application) and in view of **Kish et al.**, (Kish) U.S. Patent No. **5,890,176** and further in view of applicant admitted prior art (**AAPA**).

16. As to claims 7, 9, 10 and 16, the 831 application teaches the claimed invention as shown above. The 831 application and Kish do not explicitly teach wherein a complete version of said changed document is stored and constructing a revision history.

AAPA teaches saving a complete version of the changed document and constructing a revision history (Page 1, line 25 – Page 2, line 13).

It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of AAPA in to the 831 application in order to highlight to the user all changes since a given date by computing the difference in the current version and a previous version (Page 1, lines 25-30).

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been fully considered but are not deemed to be persuasive.

Applicant argues in substance that: There is no suggestion or motivation to combine the 831 application and Kish.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case, the Examiner states that It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teaching of Kish into the invention of the (831 application) by allowing the system to store changed versions of documents irrespective of the user's indication of significance in order to allow the system to store documents that a user may overlook and thus will give the user a diverse storage space. The fact that Kish states that it would be desirable to include all version copies of a document in a single master document goes to show the motivation that all versions of a document are stored irrespective of a users indication of significance so that all prior versions of a document are at a users disposal and accessible at any time (col. 1, line 30 – col. 2, line 16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teaching of

831 application and Kish and such a modification and combination of the 831 application would be within the knowledge generally available to the skilled artisan and thus meet the scope of the claimed limitation as currently recited.

18. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shawki S Ismail whose telephone number is 571-272-3985. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2155

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shawki Ismail
Patent Examiner
July 7, 2006


BHARAT BAROT
PRIMARY EXAMINER